



Meeting Minutes

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)

Full Board Meeting

June 29 and 30, 2022

Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Tri Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates	2
Recognition of Outgoing Board Members	9
Public Comment	10
Board Leadership Elections	11
Open Discussion	11
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Five-Year Review	13
Fiscal Year 2023 Hanford Advisory Board Work Plan and Calendar	15
Committee Reports	20
Departing Member Perspectives and Round Robin	22
Board Business	27
Closing	27
Meeting Recording	28
Attachments	28
Meeting Attendees	29

This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, welcomed meeting participants. She notified the participants that the meeting was being recorded and asked participants to sign in.

Steve Wiegman, Public at Large and HAB Chair, welcomed participants and provided opening statements. He thanked those participating that day and explained that meeting would be the last for some HAB members, as membership terms were ending. He stated that it would be time to “pass the mantle” to new leadership moving forward. He introduced Michael Berkenbile as the new Deputy Designated Federal Officer.

Michael Berkenbile, US Department of Energy (DOE), announced that this meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). He stated that the HAB’s role was to provide policy-level advice and recommendations regarding DOE Environmental Management (DOE-EM) site-specific issues.

Ruth provided a review of meeting etiquette and reviewed the meeting agenda.

Meeting Minute Adoption

Meeting minutes for the March 2022 Board meeting were adopted without comment.

Tri Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Updates

US Department of Energy Update

Brian Vance, DOE, provided DOE’s update presentation. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to present and the opportunity to do so in person.

He explained that DOE and its contractors continued to deliver progress across the Hanford Site and continued to progress through challenges associated with the complex mission. He felt that the teamwork developed between DOE and its contractors over the past few years was pivotal for some of the Site’s recent successes. He noted that, for the first time in a while, his presentation did not include a slide related to COVID-19, though he noted that the Site continued to feel the impacts related to supply chain challenges and workforce availability. DOE and its contractors continued to work around those issues.

He reviewed the Site priorities, starting with the health and safety of the workforce as the top priority. Beyond that was the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) project. He started that the second campaign of the Tank-Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) system had begun and an ion exchange column changeout was underway. The system was advancing toward continuous operations in preparation to support DFLAW.

The plant cooling water was back in operation, with a modification to address a previously discovered issue. DOE was gratified to see the teamwork on display as corrective actions were being worked through. He stated it was seamless and appeared to be a single team where one could not tell the difference between DOE and its contractors. Testing was continuing as the team progressed toward melter heat up. The team was focusing on operations and working toward an environment of operational excellence. Brian explained that the team was benefitting from the support from both Bechtel and Amentum in that regard, with each company bringing their experience from other industries.

Brian reviewed photographs from the DFLAW project, showing the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) exhaust treatment system testing, a new Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF) chiller, ongoing work at the Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF), and others. He explained that the plant was effectively in

operational status as the team was transitioning toward melter heat up. He expected that the culture would continue to evolve as the “machine comes to life.” He expected that the experiences in overcoming challenges and developing contingencies would galvanize the team and the site.

He stated that the DFLAW was not just about the WTP, but also included ETF, LERF, and the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF). Multiple projects were ongoing across all those facilities. He explained that, in operations, no individual facility could shut down without impacting another, and as a result, outages required coordination. He stated that there needed to be “one team, one site, one mission at the end of the day.” DFLAW was providing the team the opportunity to unite.

Brain announced that there was a Consent Decree amendment issued on the previous Friday that served to provide relief to some milestones that were impacted by pandemic-related conditions. He explained the site remobilization efforts and how those milestone changes were determined as a result. The changes were made to protect DOE’s legal rights and to recognize the challenges faced during the pandemic. However, despite the change in milestone requirements, DOE was still working toward hot commissioning of DFLAW by the end of 2023.

Moving on, he reviewed the Site’s risk reduction efforts. He announced that the groundwater program was on track to treat 2 billion gallons of water again in fiscal year (FY) 2022, recalling that it was presently at approximately 1.7 billion gallons. This process was being accelerated by groundwater flushing, which pushed contaminated groundwater toward the extraction wells.

Progress was continuing in regard to equipment fabrication for the Waste Encapsulation Storage Facility (WESF), which would support the eventual transfer of 1,936 radioactive cesium and strontium capsules from wet to dry storage. A full mockup was developed for a cell within WESF, which had proven to be valuable for several projects such as the Sludge Treatment Project and the Building 324 project.

In Building 324, the 11th of 13 micropiles was being installed. The micropiles—which are essentially soil column pillars—ensure the facility remains stable when excavation begins. A key transition point for that project would be when they cut into the floor, as the materials would begin to degrade at an accelerated rate once exposed to the higher levels of radioactivity. He stated that the project continued to make good progress and he was pleased that lessons learned from the past few years had been applied.

He noted that the K-East steel structure construction was underway, representing a change to the Hanford Site skyline, and was on track for completion by the end of the year. Additionally, good progress was being made on the demolition of the K-West Fuel Storage Bunker, which was one of the last big demolition projects on the River Corridor.

Brian discussed infrastructure maintenance and improvement efforts next, with a note of its importance, even if it was not always highlighted. He announced the completion of a new multi-craft maintenance facility that was replacing a “hodge-podge” of older facilities that were not as efficient as they could be. He expected that the new facility would result in positive efficiencies and improved team morale. Additionally, a new 222-S Laboratory office building was under construction to replace a 50-year-old facility. The new Central Plateau Water Treatment Facility was progressing as well. He noted that those highlighted projects were only a small selection of the infrastructure improvement efforts underway.

He reviewed the Hanford Site workforce initiatives, stating that people were the Site’s most important asset. DOE was working to assess factors around retention in order to improve it. They were working to emphasize progress being achieved around the Hanford Site, as it was important for DOE’s team to see the connection to the work that was being done, not only to the Site, but to the community as well. He

emphasized that, should the DOE team not do its job well in regard to the Site, it would impact the whole region, and when it did the job well, it supported the economic prosperity of the region.

It was hoped that, by celebrating successes on a recurring basis, and reinforcing the importance of the work being done, the team could instill pride among the workforce that would assist in not only retaining, but also recruiting workers.

He reviewed recent and ongoing recruitment efforts. The DOE and its prime contractors held a successful career event in March and was planning another in the fall. They were partnering with several colleges in the region, reaching out to national professional organizations and veterans, and hosting summer internship programs.

Additionally, DOE was continuing its community and stakeholder engagement efforts. Of note, the Hanford Site was reopened for tours, providing the opportunity to bring community and national leaders to the Site. DOE offered windows of opportunity for local leaders to visit the Site in July. DOE maintained a robust tribal affairs division, now led by Amanda Velasquez as the new Tribal Affairs Program Manager. Brian showed a picture of a recent visit by Governor Inslee, noting that it was a great opportunity to show some of the progress being made, and discussed visits by several DOE officials.

Brian stated that we had been advocating at every venue he went to for people to go visit the Hanford Site. At the time, the general Site tours were for those that were invested in the mission, rather than the general public. He hoped that the HAB would take the opportunity to see it, stating that the pictures did not do it justice.

He moved on to discuss other environmental cleanup and preservation efforts, reviewing the activities associated with wildlife. There were buffer areas that were set up for nesting eagles and hawks. He stated that the Hanford Site had been nominated for the Presidential Migratory Bird Federal Stewardship Award, though that award was ultimately granted to the US Coast Guard.

He discussed work done with some of the other Site tenants, remarking that the Site was not only about cleanup. He announced that the B Reactor tour had strong attendance since reopening, with many visitors on Memorial Day and thousands over the summer. However, that was paused due to COVID-19 conditions. The Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory (LIGO) opened its exploration center in June. He noted that he and the Site leadership team signed up for a tour of the LIGO facility in order to re-sensitize themselves to the tenant's needs. As landlord, DOE recently completed a NEPA assessment to support Energy Northwest's advanced reactor demonstration project and did a lease amendment for Energy Northwest to do the necessary characterization to support NRC licensing for the reactor, should that move forward.

In closing, he reiterated that DOE and its contractor team continued to make tremendous progress. They continued to work in order to maximize the value of taxpayer dollars. He recognized that many of the members of the HAB had served for a long time and thanked them for their interest and contributions over the years. He was hopeful that those members would remain engaged as members of the public.

Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) Update

Stephanie Schleif, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), supported by Ryan Miller, Ecology, provided the Ecology update.

Stephanie thanked every for joining, noting that she was glad to be back in person after over two years of virtual meetings. She would be discussing Ecology's recruitment, outreach, and educational efforts, as

well as the recent Governor's visit, holistic negotiations, and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) compliance activities.

She noted that Brian Vance also discussed recruitment efforts at length, acknowledging that each agency was competing for employees in the environmental field and was a challenge for each agency. Ecology had been doing outreach and sharing its mission, which was starting to show results. Since its last update, Ecology had filled nine positions, with a dozen other recruitments in various stages of the hiring process. She stated that, as it had been stressed before, knowledge transfer and mentoring the next generation of Ecology's team was critical for long-term success.

She noted that many of Ecology's open positions were for Environmental Specialists levels 4 and 5, though in-training were being planned for the future. She shared some of her own professional background, noting that she believed that Ecology's program had a great mission and culture. She hoped that HAB members would share Ecology's opportunities with anyone that might be interested or qualified.

Ryan reviewed Ecology's outreach efforts. He explained that Ecology continued to have regular engagement with the HAB, congressional delegations, tribes, and other stakeholder groups. He reviewed some specific outreach events. Ecology joined a Hanford Journey even along with the Yakama Nation and Columbia Riverkeeper, where Ecology's Director Laura Watson provided remarks. Let's Talk About Hanford events were continuing. Ecology participated in the Salmon Summit, where it shared information on Hanford habitat and wildlife to hundreds of fourth and fifth grade students.

He provided information on the Governor's recent visit to the Hanford Site. During that visit, there was roundtable discussion held at Ecology, which included tribal representatives along with business and interest leaders, to consider the need for renewed investment. A tour of the Hanford Site and LIGO facilities were held. Of note, the White House amended its FY23 Hanford budget by \$191 million, exceeding the previous year's budget. Ryan was thankful for the senators that advocated for more funding but noted that more would be required to keep the mission on schedule.

Stephanie explained that David Bowen was presently representing Ecology in the ongoing TPA negotiations. She provided a review of what was being covered in those negotiations: tank retrieval and closure, timing of tank waste treatment, mitigation measures, in interim disposal of tank waste, as well as milestone changes. It was hoped that a tentative agreement on single-shell tank (SST) milestones could be reached by the end of the year.

She provided a summary of compliance activities performed since the last Ecology update presentation, including a list of inspections performed and compliance reports issued. She reviewed the upcoming public meetings and public comment periods.

Noting that there had been interest from the HAB on the status of the Site-Wide Permit, frequently referred to as "Rev. 9," she provided an update on the progress made toward renewal. She explained that there had been approximately 4,000 comments as a result of a public comment period. Ecology went through an extended process with the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) program to review comments and address concerns.

The baseline for 15 of the 28 permit units were moved to May 2023, allowing time for additional resource hired, implementation of an expedited issue resolution process, and completion of permits needed for DFLAW. Rev. 9 was considered to be a priority with resources being dedicated to the effort within Ecology, DOE, and Site contractors, and May 2023 was considered to be a non-negotiable deadline at that point.

US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Update

David Einan, EPA, provided comments. He introduced his staff that were present, Roberto Armijo and Geoff Schramm of EPA. He noted that EPA recently concluded some recruitment efforts and among the new staff was a new Regional Administrator for EPA, Casey Sixkiller.

He noted that much of what he might have discussed had already been covered within DOE and Ecology's presentations. He noted that, while Brian Vance discussed many of the high-visibility projects on site, there was still a lot of other work being done on Site, such as the work at 100-BC, that he hoped would not be forgotten.

He noted that there was a new milestone change comment period that would be opening soon. He looked forward to receiving those comments and sharing what was being done at EPA. He stated that, though negotiations were never fun, he looked forward to seeing the conclusions and their results. He appreciated the efforts being put forth on Rev. 9. He noted that there would soon be a change in the RCRA program for Hanford, as the present expert on that program would soon be retiring.

He invited questions from the Board.

Board Questions

Mike Korenko, Grant and Franklin Counties, provided a strategic suggestion to apply when the TPA agency representatives were communicating with congressional delegations. He suggested that DOE could submit a ten-year objective to collapse the Hanford Site boundary to that of the Central Plateau. With that, the Site progress could be more easily seen as that boundary shrank, instead of waiting for the Vitrification Plant to indicate the Site's progress. He recognized that it would be a long process to get that effort started, with challenges, but felt it would be worthwhile and serve as an effective means of communicating progress to those less familiar with the Site.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, explained that she had learned of a letter issued from the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) that identified quality assurance (QA) management process issues related to TSCR. She asked Brian Vance to discuss those issues. Brian stated that there 13 or 14 issues identified. To correct those, DOE worked with Bechtel and created a "war room" or "collaboration room" to bring the teams together and work through the issues among the leadership and erode "entrenchment" issues that had developed over time. Each of those issues had since been worked through and retired. He explained that at DFLAW, design changes were no longer being considered unless absolutely necessary, as any change could have ripple effects across all the related systems. He felt the process had since become robust, and the team had gotten to the point where challenging conversations could be held more easily than they could in the past, thanks to the Site's culture shift.

Liz asked Brian to discuss vendor reliability. Brian explained that the Site applies a Commercial Grade Dedication (CGD) process, where the vendor's pedigree for QA on specific pieces and parts are validated. It was a mature process that typically had great support from the vendors. Brian noted that, were there interest, the topic could be further explained to the Tank Waste Committee (TWC).

Liz commented that, in regard to public involvement, she felt that not everyone saw eye-to-eye about what robust and quality public engagement looked like or consisted of. She stated that she hears a lot of statements from DOE about how it goes well, but she would prefer to see regional engagement and engagement on more general topics, beyond those that were required. She noted that the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) had offered a lot of advice on that topic.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest, explained that she lived in Spokane and travelled for the meeting. She was glad to be meeting in person and meeting the new regulators. She remarked that DOE's presentation had slides related to risk reduction and public involvement and asked if there were plans for a conversation with the Board regarding the leak of SST B-109 and what conversations were planned for the broader public in the region about what would be done with the tank.

Brian stated that DOE was working with the State of Washington to determine the path ahead. He explained that, through it was simple to say a leaking tank was bad, such things were not so simple in the context of Hanford. Decisions were made on the Site based on risk profile. He stated that the leaking tank was in an area of the Central Plateau where, during the national security mission, much waste was discharged to the soil, and as a result, active mitigations were already in place. He stated that the leak was not a risk to the workforce, nor was it a risk to the river, and it did not add value to go after the leak in comparison to higher risks on the Hanford Site. It was not within the top 50 when ranking Site risks. He stated that DOE would continue to work with the State to develop a path forward. Amber encouraged DOE and Ecology to use that opportunity to address the public on what the options and alternatives were.

Richard Bloom, City of West Richland, asked how many ion exchange columns had been used for TSCR, now that it was approaching 300,000 gallons treated and if it would be safe to assume 100,000 gallons per column and 10 columns per million gallons treated. Brian confirmed that two ion exchange columns had been changed out to that point and agreed with the assumed rate of use.

Richard recounted some of his own experience working at Hanford and within the DOE Complex over the course of 40 years. He thought that, when recruiting, it needed to be considered how much an employee would enjoy doing a job. Additionally, he noted that he was on a board for Ben-Franklin Transit (BFT) and was pushing to provide a scheduled bus route to serve Hanford. That service would not rely on DOE funding, nor would it have Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (HAMTC) issues. He asked for DOE's understanding that the commute to the Site and back was a big detriment to working there and asked that DOE welcome the option of BFT service. He noted that he had been working for that option for over a decade, despite consistent rejection, and stated that DOE was not responsible for how employees got to the Site but was responsible for having them there altogether.

To Ecology, referring to Rev. 9, Richard stated that a 20,000-page document could never be effectively reviewed. He felt that a successful permit needed to be much shorter, providing examples of successful air permits. He asked about the results of compliance reviews. Stephanie Schleif stated that she had not personally reviewed those results and would need to check with that group. Richard asked that any identified concerns be brought to the public's attention. He stated that B-109 was a primary example of a mistake in permitting, as a leaking tank could never be considered RCRA compliant, but it was a mistake that was agreed to long ago. He suggested those be regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) instead.

Chris Sutton, Public At Large, asked when Ecology might envision a public meeting on the Central Plateau milestones might be held. Stephanie confirmed that was planned for August 9.

Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper, asked for Stephanie's perspective on the Board's role in tracking Ecology's compliance inspections. She asked how the Board might best track those and what level of detail might be appropriate. Shelley felt that permitting was what the Board should be focusing on in order to understand the concerns and risks. Stephanie stated that Ecology would consider providing more information during that portion up its update presentation in the future, such as noting where concerns were discovered. She explained that, when there were findings, Ecology issues reports and worked to

resolved those with DOE. She was happy to provide additional information on that and expand the information that was shared.

Robert Thompson, City of Richland, stated that he enjoyed it when difficult questions were asked of the TPA agencies. He was optimistic for the progress that could be made but recognized that the mission was being done in a challenging environment. He hoped that the Vitrification Plant would be up and running, eventually, he felt that was not the complete solution the Site's high-level waste (HLW) problem and he hoped that might be something for the Board to assist in solving. He felt that three years to resolve TPA negotiations was excessive, should each of the TPA agencies truly share the same goals. He stated that, from the public's perspective, the negotiations seemed to be difficult because none of the agencies wanted to see any authority or power go to another, and the longer those negotiations stalled, the risk to the community continued to increase. He hoped to learn about the long-term plans for the Site's HLW inventory, including the waste that would not be vitrified, from each agency's perspective.

Brian responded, stating that he appreciated Robert's passion and intent. He explained that the negotiations needed to be completed in order for the agencies to not only determine the path ahead, but also to determine what was both affordable and achievable. DOE's first objective was to deliver the DFLAW plant and begin treating waste, and from there it could start to broaden the conversation. DOE thought of the workforce and the community first and recognized that there were longer-term challenges being faced, while making the best decisions it could from risk, technological, and funding perspectives. Once waste was being treated, other initiatives like the Test Bed Initiative (TBI) and Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) could open new paths for new permit applications. He stated that there were a lot of aspects in play, and he thought there was a path ahead, but the negotiations needed to conclude first. He stated that the first hurdle was a particularly high one.

Stephanie stated she had little to add beyond Brian's statement, but Ecology had been talking to DOE about TBI and would be reviewing the research and that the State stood ready to support the initiative.

David Einan contributed, stating that EPA did not have a big role in the tank waste treatment program, but agreed that getting DFLAW started was important and would serve to prove that the waste could be treated. He shared that he lived in the area his whole life, and as a third-generation Hanford worker, the results mattered to him. He felt it was important to make a reasonable decision, even if it was not a perfect one. He agreed that it was important to take that first step before they could focus on the other problems.

Steve Wiegman stated that the discussion being held reminded him why the HAB's future was important. He recalled his own experience with the Site, starting with his first day on the job. One of his jobs was getting Rockwell, a previous prime contractor, in compliance with newly implemented requirements. He stated that, when saltwell pumping was being done on the tanks, the team knew the job couldn't be completed, and the tanks could not be made RCRA-compliant. He apologized that the path was taken in that way, but stated it was done and now it needed to be dealt with. He hoped that the TPA agencies and the HAB could resolve such issues for the sake of the next generation.

Steve asked that those that join the HAB in the future remain engaged with the issues, as they were important. He thought that the conversations held in that day's meeting would set the stage for honest conversation going forward. He reminded everyone that the laws and rules were not written for Hanford specifically, and they could never all be followed completely as a result, but the work needed to continue for the sake of the community's future.

Recognition of Outgoing Board Members

Michael Berkenbile provided initial comments to recognize outgoing Board members. He stated that, although he was new to the HAB, he was especially appreciative of the opportunity to be there and to acknowledge the service of all HAB volunteers, particularly those that served the board for many years. He echoed Brian Vance's earlier remarks and added that advisory committees have played an important role in shaping programs and policies of the federal government from the earliest days of the Republic. He stated that, since President George Washington sought the advice of such a committee during the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794, the contributions made by these groups have been impressive and diverse.

Michael stated that in every community across the country, there are people who make a difference by volunteering and being a volunteer can be a demanding task. To the outgoing members, he thanked them for their contributions of time, energy, and efforts to the HAB. Their passion and commitment had made an impact. He trusted that the future members of the HAB would work to build upon their legacy of service, constructively collaborating and contributing to the development of consensus advice and advancing awareness and understanding of Hanford's cleanup mission for years to come. He provided a closing "thank you."

David Einan stated that he was honored to recognize the contributions of the outgoing HAB members on behalf of EPA. He recognized that the contributions made were a result of day-to-day sacrifices to time, attention, and other responsibilities made in order to better the Hanford cleanup mission and the impacted communities. He thanked them for the time they had shared together. He recognized that they have been through challenging times, including the recent pandemic and other sudden changes, and spoke for EPA in stating that their service and knowledge had been invaluable. Those individuals' diverse experience were what contributed to and constituted an effective advisory board that served the local and regional communities. He asked that, as their formal roles with the Board came to a close, that they continue to offer their insights through public comment periods and by helping to mentor the new members of the HAB. He announced that Emerald Laija, EPA, was joining remotely from Washington DC to provide additional comments.

Emerald recalled her start with the EPA in 2009, working with HAB under the mentorship of Dennis Fault. She found it rewarding, and having since moved on, she thought about the HAB often and often heard more about the HAB than other Site-Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) at a headquarters level. She said One of the things that made it unique was how active the stakeholders were when it came to cleanup at Hanford, and she expected that was in large part due to those that have been sitting at the HAB "table" for so many years. She thanked the HAB members for their work in better the cleanup at Hanford, the input they had provided, and the efforts they made in pushing the cleanup agencies and regulators to do their best work.

Stephanie Schleif announced that the Ecology team put together a thank you signed by approximately 20 of the personnel in Ecology's Nuclear Waste Program for each of the outgoing HAB members. She appreciated the opportunity to work with the HAB and its subcommittees. She felt that the dedication its members had shown, support given, and time spent championing the Hanford cleanup efforts were invaluable. She also relayed comments from David Bowen: He thanked the HAB members for their dedication over the years as an essential voice, helping Ecology to understand the community's priorities and motivating the Ecology team to further consider the benefits of various concepts and proposals. The HAB represented a unique format that facilitated recurring interactions between the public stakeholders and the agencies responsible for cleanup, with the end result being the development of well-informed decisions. He relayed his sincere appreciation for those willing to serve on the HAB.

Public Comment

Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters, provided the following statement:

“After more than 25 volunteer years dedicated to a better, safer, and cost-effective Hanford cleanup as a member of the HAB, I submitted my resignation effective June 30, 2022.

I was privileged to serve as chair or vice chair for 18 of those years. As difficult as it is for me to leave the HAB, I just don’t have the heart to participate in dismantling the incredibly successful processes developed by HAB members to ensure fair, transparent, and inclusive discussion. Through education and discussion, HAB members brought diverse opinions together to develop and issue by consensus more than 300 letters of well-informed advice, recommendations, and white papers issued to DOE, Ecology, and EPA. Each of those documents were reflective of HAB member and public values.

It has become impossible for me to reconcile the DOE tenant of operating with ‘noble intent’ with the fact that, within the next 12 months, I estimate that 90% of the HAB’s institutional knowledge will have been lost as valued Board members are removed from the HAB via implementation of term limits and waivers being eliminated under the guise of diversity.

I applaud and welcome new Board members and urge you to take some time to read past advice—it’s available electronically and it will help you as you navigate the Hanford world. Ask all kinds of questions! Always remember: your voice matters.

I am honored to have worked with so many wonderful, dedicated HAB members and Tri-Party Agency staff over the years and count many of them as dear friends. I will remain hopeful for the best possible Hanford cleanup that protects the citizen of the Pacific Northwest, the Columbia River, and the environment for future generations.”

Dan Serres, the Conservation Director at Columbia Riverkeeper, commented that, though he was no longer on the Board, he appreciated the work that HAB members had done in broadening the understanding of the issues around Hanford cleanup. He thanked the members of the HAB that remained engaged, working on behalf of the communities impacted by Hanford cleanup. He thanked Shelley Cimon in particular, as someone that agreed to represent Columbia Riverkeeper and had done so for years, proving knowledge and perspective informed by decades of experience. He stated she has worked tirelessly, much of which was unacknowledged, for the benefit of the communities relying on Hanford cleanup. Further, she helped to educate a broad range of people about the project to assist in their own involvement, himself included. He stated that Shelley taught him to see the Columbia River in a different way and to see the Hanford Reach for its beauty and potential. He asked that the poison of the Hanford Site be kept from the river and thanked Shelley once again.

Kevin Burdet, a Seattle University law student interning with Heart of America Northwest, asked a question of Ecology regarding the B-109 leakage. He stated that previously set deadlines for negotiation completion were July of 2021, which what then extended. It had been a year since that point. He stated that Laura Watson, Director of Ecology, said that if Ecology was unable to reach it agreement, Ecology had the regulatory authority to issue an order that specified actions that DOE must take in order to stop the tank leak, with a schedule for such actions. He asked if there was a new deadline for agreements. He also asked the EPA had any plans to intervene in order to ensure the tank leak was addressed, stating that it had been three years since the tank had been leaking, and a year since notification.

Ruth Nicholson provided clarification, stating that comments were invited during public comment period, but questions could not be answered during that period. She stated that EPA and Ecology were invited to connect with him regarding his questions.

Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation, provided comments regarding Board members that were leaving the HAB. She explained that, though she was not part of the HAB directly, she had worked with it indirectly and hoped to be joining the Board and as alternate. She stated that the service of those members was invaluable and the knowledge they brought was irreplaceable. She wished that there could be a compromise made where, instead of many Board members leaving at once, some of the institutional knowledge could be retained. She wished for the opportunity to have learned from those members. She commented to DOE that, were there a way to do a gradual exit for those members over the course of three to four years, she thought that the HAB, community, and the Hanford Site cleanup would benefit. She stated such a method was within DOE's discretion to enact.

During the second day's public comment period, Renee Larsen, an extern with Heart of America Northwest and law student at Seattle University, stated that she recognized that there were complicated issues around Hanford that she was only newly exposed to. She explained that she lived in Washington State her whole life and stated that she knew nothing about the threat that Hanford posed until she met Gerry Pollet. She suggested that there should be more outreach at schools, community centers, and other public locations. She clarified that it should not be for the purpose of fear mongering, but so people were aware. She felt it was important for Washington residents to understand the environmental concerns that might inform them.

Board Leadership Elections

Ruth Nicholson explained the need to hold interim elections for HAB chair and vice chair, as both the present HAB chair and vice chair, Steve Wiegman and Shelley Cimon respectively, would each be reaching the end of their membership terms following June 30.

She announced that the nominations received to date included Jan Catrell, Washington League of Women Voters, for chair and Susan Coleman, Public at Large, for vice chair. Ruth invited additional nominations. There were no further nominations received.

Jan explained that she understood that it could be upsetting as change was occurring quickly but saw opportunity in the reconstitution of the Board to achieve more going forward. She stated that it would be her honor to serve in that role, should she be chosen.

Ruth invited HAB members to vote for their preferred candidates. Once counted, it was announced that Jan Catrell and Susan Coleman were voted in as the HAB's interim chair and vice chair, respectively.

Open Discussion

Tom Galioto, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC), provided comments on the departing Board members. He felt it was a momentous time that the Board was experiencing. He recalled that he has gained wisdom from many people during his time on the Board and stated that "we don't meet people by accident." He was honored to have the opportunity to work with everyone on the HAB, and particularly those whose membership terms were ending, noting that many of those were in leadership positions and among the most active during his own time on the Board. He stated that he would miss working with those individuals and benefitting from their energy and experience. He wished them well and hoped to continue his relationships with them as friends and colleagues outside of HAB activities.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, stated that, though he would leave the board, his organization would be well represented by Amber Waldref and Alfonso Contreras going forward. He explained that he was involved in the team that create the model that the HAB used, having gone through negotiations what went on for a couple of years. He worried that the history of the Board was being forgotten, and in forgetting that, the goals and benefits of being open were also being forgotten. He stated that those benefits included the input provided to agency decision makers, with the knowledge that they could reach better decisions when listening to diverse viewpoints, and in order to listen to diverse viewpoints, one needed to allow for those viewpoints to choose who represented them.

Gerry stated that idea was part of the model of the HAB and that DOE was not a willing participant in that initial model. Through the leadership of the Keystone Center of Colorado, a vision of how to build long-lasting community support for cleanup was determined, which included inviting disparate views to the table, and having those people work together in seeking consensus. As a result, a regional effort in Hanford cleanup support was built, which served as model for the nation that had been written about time and time again as a model for public involvement and engagement. He stated that distinction was being thrown out by a militaristic command structure that was only interested in directing the advice it would receive. By directing the advice received, he stated, the big picture issues, be it from the workforce or the public, would be missed.

He provided an several examples of the Board's input, which contributed to the creation of the Site's beryllium program, the Site's groundwater program, prioritization of River Corridor cleanup, working inward toward the Central Plateau. He stated that without public consensus, those pieces of advice would not have been created and that the ideas and perspectives that led to that advice was the result of the public choosing its own representation. He felt that a loss of expertise and vision would be lost as a result of the changes to the Board membership, which would ultimately lead to a less funding for the Site. He stated that his organization carried a lot of the load in lobbying for the cleanup of Hanford, and he did not expect it would see a see a reason to continue to advocate for funding for a plant that was designed to treat tank waste if the Site's manager did seem to care that a tank was leaking to the environment.

Gerry hoped that the agencies would rethink the membership changes. He stated that there was another route that could be taken: The States of Washington and Oregon had stated they valued diverse input, knew the models for public involvement, and were building models similar to the HAB's for environmental justice efforts. He stated that there could be an advisory board created by the State of Washington with the same representational principles and the same charter, which could be funded by DOE. He stated this may be necessary because Washington needed independent advice. Further, he stated, not letting the community choose its own representation was counter to environmental justice principles. He expected that the State of Washington would be discussing creation of such a board. Gerry felt that the HAB and the advisory board to the State of Oregon had shown the value of diverse viewpoints reaching consensus on advice was worthwhile.

He recalled his related testimony to Congress in 1991, where he stated that he hoped to one day walk safely along the shorelines of the Columbia River with his newborn daughter. He stated that she was 30, presently, and they never had that opportunity. He wished the same for her child and future generations, one day. Gerry thanked those on the HAB for their dedication and looked forward to working with them in the future.

Bob Suyama, Benton County, explained that he had been a member of the Asian American minority his whole life, requiring that he work harder to be where other would just belong. He thanked DOE, in the name of diversity, for determining that he would be part of the majority for the first time in his life: old,

male, too well educated, too experienced and knowledgeable of Hanford, and had served for too long. As a result, he decided that he would join his colleagues in departing the Board. He wished that departing and new HAB members ever success in continuing to provide support to the cleanup mission.

Robert Thompson felt that Gerry's statement was important. He stated that, though he did not agree with Gerry often on policy, that was okay, because it was the diversity of thought among the Board's membership that was important. He felt that the TPA agencies needed to understand that diversity was important to them too. When he looked at the HAB's work plan for the following fiscal year, he stated it was directed at a group of people who lost a lot of institutional knowledge. The region needed representation, rather than a selection of people that would give the agencies the answers they wanted. He felt it was important for the Board to have the opportunity to weigh in on issues that were important to the region, rather than a "cherry-picked" selection from the agencies.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Five-Year Review

Michael Cline, DOE, presented an overview of the CERCLA Five-Year Review. He introduced himself as the director for the Soil and Groundwater Division, which had the responsibility for groundwater remediation, sampling and monitoring programs, and related decision documents.

Michael explained that CERCLA gave DOE the authority to perform cleanup actions. It was agreed upon by each of the TPA agencies. He noted that, in a commercial environment, the EPA would have the authority to go after a responsible party for cleanup costs, but that was not so for a government site. EPA would also be the one to develop the Five-Year Review for a commercial cleanup, but for a federal project the associated agency instead develops the and submits it to EPA. On the Hanford Site, DOE develops the review while working with EPA to ensure concurrence.

He explained that the CERCLA review was required to be done every five years once cleanup remedies are selected and documented in records of decisions (ROD) or interim remedial action records of decision (Irod) and would continue to be required until cleanup achieved unlimited use and unrestricted exposure levels for related contaminants. Include technical assessments of remedy implementation and performance. Based on the assessments, protectiveness determinations are made, defined as: Not Protective, Will be Protective, Protective in the Short Term, or Protective.

He explained that the Hanford Site now contained three National Priorities List (NPL) sites: the 100, 200 and 300 Areas, and Operable Units (OU) were established within each of these three NPL sites. Thirty OUs with RODs or IRODs were addressed in this review, including 23 source OUs and seven groundwater OUs.

Michael reviewed a flowchart that demonstrated how protectiveness determinations were made and explained the findings of the review. Each OU with a ROD or IROD were determined to be Will Be Protective, Protective in the Short Term, or Protective. Seventeen OUs received no protectiveness, as they lacked an ROD or IROD for the time frame the report was reviewing. Those would be addressed in future reviews. He reviewed the specific determinations by site and their location, using visual aids within his presentation.

He explained that an issue identified within the review, historic use and release of polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) at Hanford not having been characterized, was an issue across the country. He explained that PFAS was a foam chemical used in firefighting that was recently identified as a substance hazardous to health. It would need to be determined if PFAS were present in Hanford Site groundwater. He noted that a previous 400 Area investigation did not find any, but that needed to be determined at a Site-wide level.

He reviewed the other issues identified. For several areas, groundwater needed to be evaluated against hexavalent chromium water quality standards, as the groundwater had the potential to move to surface water levels. He expected that issue could arise in other units. Other areas were identified where additional characterization would be needed for various contaminants.

He explained that the report would be publicly available in the Administrative Record. The next evaluation period would be from 2021 through 2025, with the report due in 2027.

Regulatory Perspective

Roberto Armijo highlighted that EPA appreciated the collaboration with DOE and Ecology in development of the report. He explained that in early May, EPA issued a letter of concurrence with the protectiveness determinations. EPA had also highlighted a concern that, while the public outreach met the minimum requirements expected under CERCLA, EPA expected greater outreach to match the complexity of the Hanford Site.

Stephanie Schleif noted that Ecology's technical lead on available to assist with technical questions. She also appreciated the collaboration, noting that it allowed all agencies to stay informed.

Board Questions

Liz Mattson noted that she only recently became aware of the PFAS concern. She asked where more information could be found on what work had been done regarding PFAS at Hanford. Additionally, she wondered if there was a point person for questions on that work. Michael explained that, to date, little had been done, as DOE was awaiting policy direction from DOE Headquarters. The only thing that had been done was drinking water testing in the 400 Area. He stated that he could guide any technical questions to the appropriate person.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, asked what impact advice could have on the program and how it might fit into the protectiveness determination flowchart that Michael reviewed. Additionally, when determining protectiveness, were time and attenuation considered in that determination. Michael explained that the review was examining the implementation of the ROD. The development of the ROD would have been the point where time and attenuation were considered, if relevant, and the point at which advice might have been impactful. Were new issues identified, a ROD might need to be "reopened" or newly created.

Chris Sutton noted that, in the CERCLA Five-Year Review section associated with UP-1, he noted the presence of iodine-129 that was being hydraulically contained to stop potential migration. He noted that the report indicated that several studies had indicated that there was no effective means of treating it. He asked what the latest thinking on that topic was. Michael explained how hydraulic containment was achieved in greater detail and further research being done, concluding that little more could be done at that time.

Chris asked a follow-up question, noting that it was not specific to the Five-Year Review, but the groundwater program in general. He noted that in the related task order issues to Central Plateau Cleanup Company (CPCCo), there was an end states requirement where a long-term cleanup and management plan needed to be developed, as well a requirement for implementation of said plan. He asked if those were underway or completed and available in the public domain. Michael stated those were in the preliminary stages and the task orders were under negotiation, so little could be said to their progress. However, he did confirm that DOE wanted an overall strategy for the Central Plateau to result from the task order. Chris felt that topic would make a worthwhile briefing to the HAB, when finalized.

Gerry Pollet stated that, in a nutshell, the CERCLA Five-Year Review looked at the protectiveness to human health and exposure in relationship to remedies that could take over 100 years to complete. He asked where he could find the remedies that were protective in the tribal use scenario, stating that he could not find that, despite being a scenario that should be guaranteed under treaty rights. If it was not looked at, he asked how that aligned with each agency's commitment to environmental justice. Michael stated that he did not have much information on that immediately available and would need to look into it. Roberto contributed, stating that his understanding was that protectiveness was based on the ROD, and that was where the scenario would have been looked at.

Gerry stated those RODs chose not to use tribal scenarios in determinations, which was an abusive decision regarding environmental justice and commitments. He believed that such decisions showed that treaty rights were abrogated in the Central Plateau. He asked if the tribes were consulted on the matter. Michael explained that the tribes were sent the Five-Year Review for review, but the matter of a tribal use scenario would not be found in the Five-Year Review. Instead, that would have been a part of the ROD. He expected that with a renewed focus on environmental justice, the agencies would need to consider what things might need to be reopened. Gerry urged that the Board work with the tribes in developing advice that looked at how the relevant RODs might be reopened and account for protectiveness in a tribal use scenario. He stated that the law required a review for protectiveness, not just a review of what the paper says.

Marissa Merker, Nez Perce Tribe, stated that the Nez Perce Tribe had been asking for a tribal use risk assessment for many years. The discussion predated any of the RODs being discussed. She expected that DOE and EPA were aware of that.

Richard Bloom noted that, as the HAB moved forward with membership changes, it would be losing some of its institutional knowledge from the development of the RODs. He expected that it would be worthwhile for the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) to go over that topic to teach its new members what RODs were available and what they consisted of, as those new members would not be familiar with those. Michael agreed, noting that on the DOE side, they were working to get everything documented before its own institutional knowledge left.

Dan Strom, Benton-Franklin Health District, noted that he previously spoke about the various kinds of risks in cleanup. He stated that, for iodine-129, something could be done should the concern be related to radiation protection. He explained how radioactive iodine could be diluted with non-radioactive or stable iodine and the associated ratios required in order to reduce the radioactive dose to a level that was safe. He explained that the method was intended to prevent radioactive iodine from concentrating in the thyroid and was the same as the principle behind iodine tablets used for nuclear accidents. He noted that, should the concern be keeping the Columbia River pristine, than that explanation could be ignored.

Steve Wiegman stated that, when thinking about the future of the Site, thinking should go beyond the immediate decisions and into the philosophical ideas of what should be accomplished. He expected that, going forward, there would be sacrifices. It needed to be determined if human access would ultimately be allowed, and a discussion around that would need to be held one day. He stated that the Site's end state was beyond the five- to ten-year period, but people needed to have the end in mind in order to progress.

Fiscal Year 2023 Hanford Advisory Board Work Plan and Calendar

Gary Younger, DOE, provided an overview of the draft FY23 HAB work plan and calendar. He thanked everyone that had provided input to that point and stated that he appreciated the cooperation with Ecology

and EPA in its development. He noted that the HAB's previous comments were heard and applied in further development of the document.

Gary reviewed some of the key differences from the FY22 work plan and calendar and previous iterations of the draft FY23 document that the HAB committees reviewed. He explained that the full Board meetings were planned to be held in a notably different format, with the first day of the meeting being held in the evening and focusing on TPA agency updates, questions on those updates, and introduction of work items. The second day would focus on follow-up of those items. He reviewed the year's calendar how various meetings were tentatively laid out, with preliminary topics and themes.

Gary invited questions on the items reviewed to that point.

Wording changes were suggested by HAB members to assist in clarity in regard to the committee scope, meeting timing and structure, and topics applied to committees.

Susan Coleman asked if presentations would be provided on the second day of the full Board meeting. Gary stated that was not the intention and the goal was to have those on the first day in the evening, but the schedule was flexible.

Shelley Cimon recommended that the goals for Board meetings be determined in advance. In the case of the draft FY23 HAB work plan, should the goal be to get the public involved in meetings by holding them in the evening, the meeting structure needed to be very clear so the public understood what to expect. She felt if needed to be clear that there was a body of work that it needed to accomplish.

Richard Bloom suggested that the first PIC meeting of the FY should also serve as an introduction and welcome to new members. Gary noted that the October 19 meeting on was intended to serve as a Hanford 101 meeting as well.

Dan Solitz, noting that the environmental justice topic was assigned to the PIC, explained that he felt that the environmental justice aspects should be identified by other committees, with aspects being sent to the PIC to sort out.

Steve Wiegman asked if the technical committees were informed adequately on environmental justice to initiate such a conversation. Dan stated that his understanding, based on viewing of several National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) and White House Environmental Justice Advisory Council (WHEJAC) meetings, was that such issues should be brought up by the presenters to those committees. Further, with the intention to add a more diverse Board membership on behalf of the TPA agencies, Dan expected that should there be an aspect of environmental justice to be discussed, the new members would bring those issues to attention as they were meant to represent those injustices. Steve questioned if the new Board members were specifically intended to represent those issues or if the subject matter experts for technical presentations could be relied on to bring up environmental justice topics.

Dan asked for clarification on what would be expected of the PIC in relation to environmental justice. Gary stated it was something new for DOE and an opportunity to learn. It was hoped that a dialogue would assist those "not sitting around the table" and the agencies. Dan still disagreed with the topic being "siloed" in the PIC.

The Board discussed various options on how to resolve the work plan wording on environmental justice and show that it applied to all committees.

Steve noted that he did not feel that the Board understood environmental justice well enough to have it assigned to any committee. He suggested that there should be an education process on what it meant to DOE and the Hanford cleanup specifically before it was assigned to the HAB at all.

Richard Bloom suggested that it needed to be determine what specific questions were applied to the topic. He stated that, for DOE, it was tied to funding at a federal level, which was unlikely to be seen at Hanford. He noted that it was originally defined in the work plan that the TPA agencies wanted advice on the topic, but it was not clear what specifically what those agencies wanted to be advised on. Michael Berkenbile suggested that it should be determined how a piece of advice could benefit the environmental justice program. He felt it was clear that more information was needed.

Amber Waldref stated that it appeared that there was consensus that the HAB members wanted to become more educated on the topic and wondered how the Board might best set itself up for that. Richard noted that, were there a specific issue or line of questioning defined in relation to the topic, it would become clear who the Board needed to be talking to.

Shelley Cimon proposed that a future Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting should review the Hanford Site cleanup topic through the lens of environmental justice, emphasizing that was what the Board was there to consider: cleanup. It needed to be looked at how DOE was going about cleanup and how the Site might go ahead in implementing environmental justice in the cleanup remedy. She suggested looking at case studies around the county to determine if there was anything worth flagging.

Rob Davis reminded the Board that at the most recent COTW, DOE's presenter agreed to come back for a follow-up conversation on how environmental justice was being applied across the DOE Complex. He suggested that the next step could be checking in with her, providing DOE a chance to react to the topic.

Following other edits for clarification across the work, it was determined that the Board would review the edited document during the second day of the meeting.

During the second day's review, Gerry Pollet stated that he was concerned that the Board might be waiting a year until it had a discussion on environmental justice, per the draft work plan, after it was claimed that the Board membership was being changed for the sake of diversity. Further, it was an issue that the COTW specified for environmental justice was being held during the day, rather than being discussed during one of the evening meetings, where there was greater opportunity for participation from the public. He was displeased by the May 2022 COTW on environmental justice, as the tribes were not invited to speak, and the environmental justice presentation and discussion reflected little in the way of commitment or planning. He felt that, were the Board to have a discussion and meaningful participation in environmental justice, it needed to be opened to the community. He asked that the meeting be moved up on the calendar and external guests be included. Gary thanked Gerry for his comment, stating that DOE would take that under advisement to see what works.

Eseban Ortiz, GreenLatinos, stated that he would like the tribal communities to weigh in on environmental justice, as they were separate entities that had different opinions on what the HAB or agencies should be considering on the topic.

Mason Murphy, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), stated that, for the environmental justice topic, tribal concerns, risk, and use scenarios should be taken into account. He suggested that tribal use scenarios could serve as a starting point.

Dan reiterated that, from what he learned from other environmental justice advisory councils, the issues around environmental justice should evolve organically from other issues of substance. He did not expect it would take a year for such issues to come forth.

Jan Catrell worried that a lot of the meeting time was being focused on a single item in the work plan. She felt that the Board should expect some clarification from the TPA agencies on the matter, with the aim of their briefings being to help the Board understand how environmental justice applied to cleanup, rather than relying on the Board to define it. She stated that would help the Board to focus its questions, answers, and advice on things needing its attention.

Shelley stated “where the rubber hits the road” is where the policies and ideas should be applied. She reminded the Board that the Hanford community was different from that of other sites. She felt that the Board needed to understand who might be perturbed by TPA agency proposals or decisions. She reminded the Board that John Wagoner asked the Board to be independent and bring advice back. She suggested that the Board do the appropriate research so that, when the time came to build that COTW, the Board understood what groups needed or wanted to be at the table. She felt it was incumbent upon the Board to hear from the impacted communities and to gain an understanding of how they were impacted. She felt that the previous COTW showed the Board that it did not have that understanding.

Richard asked that presenters bring to the Board what they believe to be environmental justice aspects or concerns. He noted that the work plan originally asked for advice on the topic, but he did not feel that was the correct way to go about the topic. He suggested that environmental justice instead be placed in the HAB’s guiding principles, once an understanding of the topic was reached.

Robert Thompson felt that the term environmental justice needed to be well defined and each of the Board members needed to agree on the definition in order to move forward with the topic in an effective manner. Without a common idea of what needed to be accomplished, he felt that the Board would be wasting its time and would be unable to move in a singular direction, working toward a product that would itself be a waste of everyone’s time.

Ruth Nicholson reminded the Board that it had convened an Issue Manager (IM) team to explore the topic of environmental justice, noting that interested Board members could join that group. As the previous IM team leader had since left the Board, Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy, offered to lead that team.

Gerry felt that it was not reasonable to expect that presenters could effectively bring attention to environmental justice issues, likening the idea to asking a racehorse with blinders what the crowd looks like. He suggested the presenters, being subject matter experts on technical topic, had a singular focus. He stated that it was important to have community voices involved, particularly from those impacted, to understand how they were impacted—particularly the tribal communities. He stated it was the HAB’s job to think about those aspects and the best way to start such a discussion would be to schedule a meeting on the topic much earlier, with community-based presentations and discussion.

Steve suggested that the HAB’s IM team could help to guide the path forward, noting that the term had been around for a long time, but evolved from his previous understanding of it. He felt it was a worthy topic to pursue.

Shelley stated that the Board’s institutional knowledge was being lost and was leaving in droves. She stated that no one had mentioned, either on the side of DOE or the Board, that there was a tribal scenario that examined their use of the Site, which needed to be factored in. She felt that, without institutional

knowledge, the Board would be undergoing an effort to “reinvent the wheel.” She felt a means to retain and build upon knowledge was needed.

Rob stated that DOE’s first action on environmental justice was seen: a change to Board membership. He stated that there needed to be a separation of who was impacted and what DOE was doing, as those were two different sources of information. He thought the Board should look at the important documents and advice points it has given before to—and like its values—review, understand, and potentially renew and reaffirm those by consensus.

Michael stated that he appreciated the conversation on environmental justice and the work plan. He agreed that much work needed to be done. Beyond being under advisement, it gave DOE much to think about. He stated that the Board’s concerns were understood and heard, and DOE valued what had been said over the two meeting days.

Regarding the calendar, Liz Mattson was concerned about meeting timing and the potential to write advice in the first quarter of the year. She suggested shifting dates for full Board meetings. The October meeting would move to November, and the January meeting to February. She was also concerned about the Board meeting in August, preferring September. Richard agreed, reiterating that the PIC’s October meeting could serve as a “soft Board meeting.” However, he felt that issues often arose for September meetings and preferred August.

Rebecca Holland, HAMTC, asked about a regional meeting, noting that it seemed fair to hold one as the Board was regional. Gary stated that the details of such a meeting were still being worked on, and the springtime was being considered for it. She noted that, for the current FY, the September meeting did not seem to be a certainty. Gary explained that every week in September was challenging from a scheduling standpoint and options were being considered.

Jan agreed that holding Board meetings in September and October seemed unrealistic. She was disappointed that the Board seemed to be fighting to hold a certain number of meetings every year yet was discussing cancelling some of them. She stated that the Board was eager to get back to normalcy. She discussed the viability of various months for Board meetings, stating that the calendar did not seem to reflect reality. She thought Liz’s comments seemed appropriate. Regarding regional meetings, she stated that the Board heard responses like “we’ll get back to you on that” for several years in a row, but never get a commitment.

Steve noted that, in his own experience, the initially approved calendar rarely held true, and questioned the value of approving it as a result. He wondered if scheduling might best be limited to the shorter term or if there was a need to approve a calendar at that time, as opposed to waiting. Gary noted that, for the previous year, it was asked that the draft HAB work plan and calendar could be “provisionally” approved, until the issues and concerns could be resolved. Without anything to work with, there would be no meetings or topics, and as a result, nothing to bring the group back together. He stated that, were the FY23 work plan and calendar not approved that day, the TPA agencies would ask the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) to provide provisional authority to move forward with something.

Jan stated that, should the Board give provisional approval, that the TPA agencies should provide a commitment that they would come back with a proposal for a regional meeting, a plan for COTW topics, and date adjustments. Were those commitments given, she though provisional approval would be acceptable. Gary stated that he was agreeable to making more adjustments.

Michael stated that, though he was new, it seemed clear there was a gap. Regarding September 2022, he stated that everyone seemed to agree that a decision to not meet was not ideal. However, he stated that

there was much work to be done in aligning documents, foundational work, and new member orientation. He thought that the summer months would be ideal for that. Hearing that that there were challenges identified with many of the months on the calendar, he offered that the calendar was a dynamic document. However, he recognized that “what is written gets done.” He stated that having something on paper would allow the group to move forward, recognizing that there was still much work to be done and would not likely be done that day.

Chris Sutton noted that it was defined within the draft work plan that meetings and calls could be rescheduled or added, so flexibility was already determined. He asked what the procedure for rescheduling was. Gary stated that anyone could ask to reschedule, just provide a reason. That request could be from the Board, TPA agencies, or another relevant organization. He stated DOE would be examined if the change made sense or caused further issues. He clarified that the decision would be made locally but noted that there was a contingency where a Federal Register notice was required, which were required 37 days in advance of a meeting date.

Additional clarifying points and wording changes were made throughout the work plan during the course of the discussion.

Steve reiterated the need for the document to be approved in order for the Board to move forward. Liz asked if the EIC could be involved in reworking the calendar. Steve expected that would be the case.

Ruth invited a vote on agreement to the provisional approval proposal. Quorum was achieved, and the draft document was approved as a provisional work plan and calendar.

Committee Reports

Budgets and Contracts Committee

Tom Galioto provided some comments on behalf of the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC). He announced that, for personal reasons, he stepped down as chair of the BCC, and since then, Chris Sutton had been elected as interim chair. Tom stated that he fully supported Chris, having worked alongside him for the past couple of years, and thanked him for his willingness to take on that role.

Since the last Board meeting, the BCC-led HAB Advice #312 was formally issued and had received responses from each of the TPA agencies. He stated that he was disappointed by the lack of substantive detail in DOE’s response, and DOE’s statement within the response that the advice was not actionable, due to a recommendation for acceleration of some identified cleanup priority actions. He felt that the response highlighted a need to establish better communication and cooperation between DOE and the HAB going forward, whether those lines of communication were formal or informal.

He explained that, in April, BCC members developed a list of comments and questions related to the *2022 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report*. Those comments were compiled as a letter and submitted on behalf of those members as individual stakeholders. Tom hoped that BCC would have the opportunity to review some long-standing topics of interest soon, such as the state of Hanford Site contracting.

In closing, he thanked Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, for his support as BCC’s vice chair, as well as the rest of the committee members for their contributions to the committee and HAB advice. He offered well wishes for a more positive relationship between the HAB and DOE going forward, stating that was a critical item that the community depended on. He offered Chris and Emmitt the chance to provide comments.

Emmitt recalled the time when he first joined the BCC. He explained how he felt it was an interesting journey that he learned a lot from. He stated that Tom really had a passion for the community and had a lot to teach Emmitt and the other committee members. Emmitt expected that Chris would do well leading the BCC, as Chris also had a passion for and a strong understanding of the budgets and contracts, their challenges, and the associated impacts to the Hanford Site, the HAB, and community. Emmitt stated that he enjoyed his time serving on the community and getting the chance to meet and work with the other committee members. He wished the best for the BCC.

Chris explained his reasoning for joining the BCC after starting as a member of the HAB. He stated that the committee was about more than just budgets or contracts, as the committee has provided input regarding the entire scope of Hanford, including the schedule that governs remediation. He felt that understanding funding and cost estimates around cleanup costs contributed to an informational overview of the whole Hanford Site and the work that occurs there. He hoped to encourage new members or members that had not yet joined a committee to consider the BCC, as little technical knowledge was needed to participate, and the committee had the potential to make a significant impact.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee

Rebecca Holland reported that little was new to report for the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP), as it had not held a meeting since the last committee report. Richard Bloom expected that the committee would need to assist with a “101” presentation for new HAB membership and was considering options around that presentation. Otherwise, he expected the committee would be waiting to explore and issues that might arise on the Hanford Site going forward.

Emmitt hoped that HSEP would consider traffic safety in the near future, as there were recent traffic incidents on the Hanford Site, one of which resulted in a fatality. Richard confirmed that traffic safety was in HSEP’s work plan. Rebecca noted that the committee had previously written advice on that topic as well. Emmitt felt that, in regard to recruiting, commute impacted people’s willingness to work at the Hanford Site. Richard agreed and contributed that there was a social justice aspect to that, as some might be unwilling to take a job due to the need for self-transportation.

Public Involvement and Communications Committee

Dan Solitz provided an update on the PIC. He acknowledged the contributions of Jeff Burright, who served as PIC’s chair until his recent departure from the Board. Dan was considering the need for a meeting in August where the committee could consider what was being discussed during that day’s Board meeting, considering what new HAB members might need to learn.

Ruth Nicholson clarified that Jeff had taken another job, and as a result, Dan was now shepherding the committee as vice chair.

River and Plateau Committee

Tom Sicilia explained that the RAP last met in April, where it received a presentation on the cocooning of the K-East Reactor. He stated that much of the rest of the meeting was focused on the draft FY23 HAB work plan and calendar and preparation for the Leadership Workshop meeting. For August, Tom expected that the committee would need to elect a new vice chair, as Jan Catrell was serving in that position prior to her election as interim Board chair.

Tank Waste Committee

Bob Suyama announced that he and Susan Leckband, the TWC's chair and vice chair, were both leaving the Board. The incoming leaders for the committee were Rob Davis and Marissa Merker as interim chair and vice chair, respectively. Bob appreciated their willingness to step up to those roles.

He explained that, in TWC's April meeting, the committee tried holding a conversation in a new format, focusing on discussion between the committee members and subject matter experts, rather than focusing on presentations. He felt it was an excellent approach to sharing information and that the committee was able to resolve a lot of its concerns as a result. He recommended that approach for future committee meetings, as well as Board meetings. He felt that talking was the best way to get answers.

He explained that the TWC also held a discussion on system planning, as the TPA agencies were working toward *System Plan 10*. The committee was provided the opportunity to provide input on scenarios that it would like to see in that system plan. The committee discussed Leadership Workshop topics, including the draft FY23 HAB work plan and calendar.

Ruth explained that discussions such as the one TWC held regarding system planning were another product that the Board could provide. The TPA agencies were up against a deadline, so the representatives came to the TWC for broad input, rather than a consensus product. Advice was one product that the Board could provide, but there were also other avenues of providing input that was of benefit to the TPA agencies.

Esteban Ortiz commented that, as a new Board member that was not yet familiar with some of the technical topics the committee looked at, he found the discussion held in the April meeting to be helpful in understanding what was going on at the Hanford Site and how things were being dealt with.

Bob hoped to hold a July committee call to plan a potential TWC August meeting and see what topics might be available. He stated that it had been an honor to serve and work alongside the other HAB members during his time on the Board.

Rob Davis commented that he hoped to follow Bob's lead and would make an effort to continue to work through the topics he had outlined. Marissa hoped that those that were leaving the Board and committee would continue to participate.

Other Comments

Michael Berkenbile thanked the committee leaders, and the rest of the Board members, for their service. He felt that their passion was evident from that Board meeting. He noted that communication seemed to be a common theme throughout the meeting's discussions. Noting that was a two-sided effort, he committed to reaching out to committee leaders for their perspectives were on topics of interest, not just for presentations, but also for discussion.

Departing Member Perspectives and Round Robin

Ruth Nicholson introduced the round robin discussion topic and focus question: "Reflecting on your time with the HAB, what do you wish you knew or understood when you joined the Board? What do new members need to know?"

Antone Brooks, Benton-Franklin Health District, stated that he served on the HAB twice, once representing Washington State University, and how with the Benton-Franklin Health District. He recalled that he had been interested in radiation as a child, living about 100 miles from the Nevada Test Site. He

was one of the “downwinders” in St. George, receiving about three times of the dose of those in Fukushima. In Fukushima, he stated, they evacuated, but in St. George, the children kept playing outside.

When Antone was in Utah, he worked under a grant to study how radioactive materials moved through the food chain. He happened to have the highest levels of cesium of anyone in that study. He continued to discuss his studies and career studying radiation and radioactive materials. As a Board member, he felt that science should be a big part of the decisions being made but learned that politics and perceptions were the primary drivers for decisions.

In the last portion of his career, he was the chief scientist for the DOE low dose radiation research program. It was learned that, at low dose, the human body’s response was very different from that of high dose, resulting in protective responses, but such information was not of interest to news media. He expected that the fear of radiation drove cleanup, while there was significantly more material in the river naturally than was discharged from Hanford.

Antone felt that new members coming onto the HAB needed to understand what radiation was and was not, with the *Incredible Hulk* being something that it was not. He felt that his role on the Board was to provide a bit of science to those political decisions. He enjoyed his time on the Board and expected that in the future he would be providing public comment to get his voice heard. He appreciated those that listened during his time with the Board.

Tom Galioto noted that, though he was not leaving the Board, he hoped to share this thoughts on what he wished he knew as a new member. He explained that he tried for several years to get on the Board, excited about what could be accomplished. When he joined, however, he was met with many common responses: “we tried that before,” “the TPA agencies won’t like that,” etc. Tom hoped that it would be communicated that there would be challenges and roadblocks, but also opportunities for success and times to excel. He encouraged new members to work through the frustrations and remain positive in order to achieve a positive outcome that results in helping the cleanup effort.

Dan Solitz explained that he wished he understood better the nature of the politics involved in cleanup, from the Board level up to the President of the United States. He felt that knowledge was helpful in understanding how decisions work their way up the “ladder” from DOE up to the US Office of Management and Budget, and how other parties influence those decisions, like the National Academies of Science. He likened the process to a rattlesnake, stating that the HAB was the rattle and that the message needed to be pushed to the head of the snake. He suggested that it would be good to get a political scientist to speak on the matter to help the HAB understand that dynamic.

Liz Mattson explained that she had been on the Board for a long time. During that time, she found served to assist in community building, having a place to grow as a person, and tackling issues that did not have easy answers. When discussing the draft calendar earlier that day, she recalled that the Board used to have at least one meeting per month. She worried that, for the FY23 calendar and beyond, meetings were more likely to be taken away than added in. She advised that new members fight for more meetings.

For the main lessons she learned and hoped to pass on, she advised that new members “jump in” immediately, rather than waiting until they were comfortable with the Board processes. She felt it was best to learn by doing, be it advice writing, issue managing, or leadership. She recalled her own experience providing leadership for the PIC. Though she was nervous to take on that role, she was glad that she did in the end. Additionally, she stated that the Board provided a space to build understanding, regardless of political views, religious backgrounds, or otherwise. She suggested that members take the time to build that community, by lunches, drinks, or just calling to check in with people. She thanked

those that were like family to her on the Board and said it had been a joy to work through everything alongside them. Though she was sad that things were changing, she hoped there would be a way to continue to create advice that made a difference.

Shelley Cimon recalled that she had been participating as a member of the public for a long before, before the HAB was formed, as part of the Tank Waste Task Force, which helped the TPA agencies get cleanup milestones established. She thought that one of the most important things for a new member to learn is that they did not need to know everything about Hanford, and that would be freeing knowledge to have. She clarified that HAB members could depend upon the larger group. The Board was created for everyone to have a place to speak and to find common ground, through communication, friendship, and teamwork. Through agreeing to disagree, advice had gone forward. She thought that was the strength of the HAB: the ability to find common ground. She expected that books could be written on the merits of the Board's process.

She appreciated the work of the HAB's leaders and all its members, recognizing that most everyone there was a volunteer. She thanked Jan Catrell and everyone else willing to maintain the Board going forward and providing the community the opportunity to continue to talk and find that common ground. She asked that, if there were opportunities for her to share her wisdom, to just give her a call. She felt it was imperative that history was shared, as the history of the Board was profound. She advised that, when writing advice, background information was necessary for the public to understand, and that it should not be assumed that context would be obvious to the wider public. She felt that the Board had served as a second home to her and she appreciated the friendships and opportunities it provided.

Chris Sutton explained his own experience joining the Board, having received an email from someone that he never heard of in Washington DC. Shortly after, he received a meeting announcement, and with a couple of mouse clicks, he was in a meeting. He felt that it was not easy to jump into Board activities, stating that people wanted to feel wanted or needed. He suggested that the committee leads make a pitch to new members to help them understand what could be learned and contributed, expecting that would help those new members engage more. He asked that they reach out to new people and make them feel wanted and needed.

Rebecca Holland stated that, when she started on the Board, she was nervous to speak. There were many people on the Board she looked up to that ultimately helped her get over stage fright, which ultimately led to her becoming the HSEP chair. She agreed with Liz's sentiments about a sense of community, recalling many of the things the Board used to do to get people involved, such as Hanford trivia, that were less serious and gave people a chance to laugh. She thought that the regional meetings that were held were particularly worthwhile, as people from around the region took the opportunity to ask a lot of questions. She thought that those were some of the most successful meetings that the Board had. She wondered if many might not know what the HAB was now that those meetings were no longer held.

She suggested that, to get new members engaged, the HAB should assign mentors to new members. She likened that to something that was done within the Hanford workforce, where mentors were assigned to technicians. In closing, she stated that she would miss a lot of the people that were leaving and appreciated everyone that paved the way for her and the Board.

Emmitt Jackson agreed that mentorship would be helpful to new members, recalling that when he started, Liz, Jan, and others took the time to help him. Their guidance helped him to understand how he could make a difference. He explained that he started with the Hanford Site at the age of 16, working at Plutonium Recycle Test Reactor (PRTR), a facility that had since been taken down.

Throughout his early career with the Hanford Site, he gained an appreciation for it and hoped to find a way to make a difference. He stated that he was a native of Richland, having lived in the North Richland trailer courts, which were segregated, and grew up during the “hippy generation” and the civil rights movement, which influenced the ways in which he wanted to make a difference. After his graduation, he worked in management development training and human resources, where looking at underutilized populations became part of his work. Beyond that, he began working in community engagement, travelling to places where the Hanford Site was less known and educated the public on the mission.

He stated that, at that time, the HAB was something that was respected and was an organization that he wanted to be a part of. At the time, he saw that there was a lack of Afro-American representation on the Board that he hoped to bring. Mentorship, he felt, was one of the most important things to him when he joined as a new member. He encouraged future HAB members to ask questions, become enlightened, and to talk to people. He suggested that they give the existing members a call and introduce themselves. He asked that those constituting the new Board make good use of the process. He thanked the facilitation team and everyone else that contributed to the HAB and stated that he was grateful to be a part of the Board and its process. He hoped that it would represent more diversity of thought and culture going forward, stating that the demographics had changed, not only in that region, but throughout the country. He hoped to see all kinds of people come together to make a difference at Hanford and nationwide.

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, stated that she was deeply concerned the changes to Board membership and the loss of institutional knowledge. She promised that, personally, she would continue to fight to retain that institutional knowledge. She stated that she was considering the idea of personal histories and asked that the departing members expect a call from her to digitize their stories. She stated that the Board’s story was not over and would not be for quite some time. She thought that it was critical that there was more diversity and apologized that it was not going to be achieved in a more compassionate and respectful way to those that had dedicated themselves to the Board’s process. She asked any potential or future HAB members that were listening to give her or an outgoing member a call, should they not feel prepared. She stated that Ecology would work to ensure people still have voices and are able to engage going forward.

Dan Strom stated that, several times throughout the meeting, HAB members had decried the loss to the HAB’s collective knowledge as a result of DOE’s enforcement of term limits. He hoped to quantify that loss and had created a survey to do so. He proposed that the Board try to record the impact from what he thought of as “the great purge of 2022.” After hearing from that that brought a wealth of knowledge and skill to the Board, he hoped that his questionnaire would be considered and distributed.

Richard Bloom stated that he had been on the Board as long as he’s been on City Council. He thought it was interesting that, when the Board talked about diversity, it was not necessarily about race or culture, but experience. He provided the example where some members might not know what it’s like to work on the Hanford Site first-hand, while others spent decades doing so. He recalled that he had worked on the Hanford Site and throughout the DOE Complex for almost 40 years, across multiple facilities. He stated that the Board had people of a diverse set of professional backgrounds, such as QA, health and safety, engineering, and legal. He did not feel that using ethnicity as a diversity determination was what the HAB should do, as it was about giving the public the chance to feel that it was heard. He had no idea what backgrounds or viewpoints new members might bring but hoped that it was more than “concern.” He thought that, from the public comments provided by students, there was a lack of understanding about how dangerous the Site was.

He stated that he recently completed writing the “obituary” for the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), which was in the Administrative Record for those interested in reading it. However, he stated that the risk that PFP represented was not near the risk he saw in Rocky Flats, which was located near the community and waiting to burn down. He thought it was important for the HAB to discuss risks and to discuss its own diversity in relation to those topics as it worked through the consensus process. He felt that sometimes advice went overboard, however.

Richard advised that new members “get to the point” and highlight what was important in advice. It was agreed that the background should be there, but it should be succinct. It should not include everything the HAB knows, but just what was appropriate.

Steve Wiegman stated that he enjoyed various relationships with the HAB over a number of years, as a contractor, federal employee, and then a member of the HAB. One of the things he appreciated in that time was being people being able to say what they think. He was sometimes frustrated that some people talked more than others but recognized that as a challenge of passion. For new members, he thought they needed to know who was on the Board, why they were there, and what they represented so they could begin to collaborate among those bringing different ideas. He often wondered what the quieter members might have had to offer. He recognized that there were a lot of different aspects to be considered in relation to the site, such as politics, money, dirt and wind, and anything else someone might be afraid of.

He stated that, for the new leadership, there was some building to do. He hoped that the HAB as an organization could get back to a level that was respected and trusted. He stated that change was not always easy but offered a change to build. He thought that environmental justice would be one of the topics where the Board would need to learn from others that it might not have otherwise done so. The Hanford mission would be continuing for a long time and he hoped that HAB would continue to be a part of it for a long time. He stated that everyone had a role to play, be it the DOE, the regulators, or the HAB, representing a partnership of unequals. He clarified that it was unequal only in the sense that everyone had a different role, and not that one was more important than another, but he thought that the HAB has a role that needed to be enforced.

He hoped that the HAB would once again be recognized for its diverse input and offerings and as something that did not need to be replaced. He thought that the present changes needed to play out and asked that the HAB members stayed with it and looked for the opportunities change could create. He asked that they look and learn who was coming onto the Board and what they could offer. He thanked everyone for the opportunity to have been a part of the Board.

Jan Catrell noted that she heard from several members that had been on the Board since the beginning or spent their careers on Site. She had never worked on site but joined the Board full of curiosity and commitment. She worked for the US Department of Treasury for about 20 years, where she became an expert in cargo issues and then hazardous materials transport, which led to her appointment as Radiation Detection Coordinator. At that time, she explained, DOE was working on radiation detection as there were many sources to defend against. As part of that work, she visited the Volpentest HAMMER Federal Training Center (HAMMER), which sparked her interest in participating in the Hanford mission.

Ultimately, she learned about the HAB and what meetings were held around the state, and eventually joined a regional meeting being hosted at the Seattle Center after which she decided to join. After retirement, decided to join a meeting being held in the Tri-Cities with the hope that by travelling across the state for a meeting in the winter, it would demonstrate her commitment and willingness to participate as a member. An aspect that particularly appealed to her was the sight of many women in leadership.

Soon after, she applied, was interviewed, and joined as a member. She joined the Board knowing little of the Hanford Site, but as a citizen and native of the State of Washington, she cared about the result. In determining what committees to join, she worried that the TWC could be too technical for her level of knowledge at the time, but ended up spending time in RAP, HSEP, and PIC. She learned to write advice and made an effort to contribute to moving things forward. Now, as a result of term limits, she was in a position of Board chair, something that she may have never aspired to otherwise. She felt that she was the “baby” of the group before, but with many senior members rotating off, that was no longer so.

She thanked the Board members for their confidence in her. She stated that, though she had not worked at the Hanford Site, she brought a depth of federal government experience at the headquarters level. She hoped to bring a diverse set of skills to the job, however long it lasted.

Emmitt, noting the diversity and environmental justice discussion that were held through the meeting, explained that he was a trainer at HAMMER, and as a result, saw that new recruits to the Site were coming from all ethnicities and walks of life. He challenged DOE to provide more assistance in management training to these individuals. Additionally, he noted that the federally recognized holidays of Martin Luther King Jr. Day and Juneteenth were not granted by the Site contractors. Further, he felt that DOE should promote cultural recognitions such as Hispanic or Asian Engineering Month. He hoped that the Board would consider such concerns going forward.

Board Business

Ruth Nicholson invited requests for an August meeting, noting that there was a suggestion provided that the August committee week could serve as time for a workgroup to work on HAB operations, from clarification of the HAB’s purpose and products to answering questions around how the work gets done.

Michael Berkenbile contributed, stating that he felt that the summertime served as a good opportunity for the Board to examine its operational documents. He heard about that in the Leadership Workshop initially and was intrigued by the idea. In his own review of the HAB member resource binder, he found that those documents were not in alignment with the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB) charter. He hoped that a workgroup could take the opportunity to align those, as well as help with the next new member orientation. He noted that he heard a lot on that subject and tried to capture those ideas over the course of that meeting.

Chris Sutton requested an August meeting with a “prime contracts 101” topic. He felt the topic would be of interest to the whole HAB. That could include how the indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (ID/IQ) structure was applied, what the “end states” sections meant, how contracts were funded, and how each scope was different from the others. He thought that it could consist of basic, high-level items that would benefit the members without such a background.

Jan noted that RAP would need to hold an interim election for vice chair, as she could no longer hold that position. She wondered if the process manual might be something to work on over August, with cooperation from multiple committees. Ruth explained that the proposal for the work group was a two-day “roll up your sleeves” event with the goal of clarifying various questions so that the Board did not need to rely on historical knowledge. She stated that the process manual could be part of that effort.

Closing

In closing, Steve Wiegman it had been “quite a trip” and would continue to be, both for those that were leaving the Board and those that were staying, as they continued to look for ways to express their passion for the Site. He expressed his appreciation to the facilitation team, DOE, EPA, and Ecology for their

commitment to support the HAB. He wished everyone a lot of good will and energy to keep the passion going, regardless of the person's role.

He thanked everyone for the opportunity to play and asked that those who would continue to so do to enjoy that opportunity. He hoped to continue to play on the Columbia River for years to come.

Meeting Recording

Day 1: <https://youtu.be/IIHVK6UArGo>

Day 2: https://youtu.be/ev5v4GIW_pQ

Attachments

[Attachment 1: Meeting Agenda](#)

[Attachment 2: Deputy Designated Federal Officer Slide](#)

[Attachment 3: Meeting Ground Rules](#)

[Attachment 4: Draft Meeting Minutes for the March Board Meeting](#)

[Attachment 5: DOE Update Presentation](#)

[Attachment 6: Ecology Update Presentation](#)

[Attachment 7: List of Outgoing Board Members](#)

[Attachment 8: DOE Presentation – Introduction to the CERCLA Five-Year Review and Review Findings](#)

[Attachment 9: Draft Fiscal Year 2023 Work Plan](#)

[Attachment 10: Draft Fiscal Year 2023 Calendar](#)

Meeting Attendees

Day 1

Board Members and Alternates:

Allan Felsot, Primary	Bob Suyama, Primary*	Bob Thompson, Primary*
Dan Solitz, Primary	Dan Strom, Primary	Denise Jones, Primary
Emmitt Jackson, Primary*	Esteban Ortiz, Primary*	Gene Van Liew, Primary*
Gerry Pollet, Primary*	Jacob Reynolds, Primary	Jan Catrell, Primary*
LoAnn Ayers, Primary	Maxwell Woods, Primary	Rebecca Holland, Primary*
Richard Bloom, Primary*	Rob Davis, Primary*	Shannon Cram, Primary
Shelley Cimon, Primary*	Steve Wiegman, Primary*	Susan Coleman, Primary*
Tom Galioto, Primary	Amber Waldref, Alternate*	Chris Sutton, Alternate
David Reeploeg, Alternate*	Leslie Koenig, Alternate	Liz Mattson, Alternate
Marissa Merker, Alternate	Mason Murphy, Alternate	Mike Korenko, Alternate*
Steve March, Alternate	Susan Leckband, Alternate*	

Others:

Brian Vance, DOE*	Alicia Boyd, Ecology	Tyler Oates, Bechtel*
Carrie Meyer, DOE	Ginger Wireman, Ecology*	Dieter Bohrman, CPCCo*
Gary Younger, DOE*	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	Amber Peters, HMIS*
JoLynn Garcia, DOE	Stephanie Schleif, Ecology*	Dana Cowley, HMIS*
Michael Cline, DOE	Dave Einan, EPA*	Debbie Kelley, HMIS
Mike Berkenbile, DOE*	Emerald Laija, EPA	Debra Yergen, HMIS*
Richard Buel, DOE	Geoff Schramm, EPA*	Gabriel Bohnee, HMIS
	Laura Buelow, EPA*	Jen Colborn, HMIS
	Roberto Armijo, EPA*	Joan Lucas, WRPS
	Earl Fordham, WDOH	Joy Shoemake, HMIS
	Tom Rogers, WDOH*	Michael Turner, HMIS
		Patrick Conrad, HMIS*
		Stephanie Brasher, HMIS
		Wesley Bryan, WRPS

		Abigail Zilar, AttainX
		Rob Hastings, AVANTech
		Tracy Barker, AVANTech
		Matthew Campbell, CTUIR
		Kermit Mankiller, NPT
		Li Wang, YN ERWM
		Rose Ferri, YN ERWM
		Daniel Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper
		Jeff Wyatt, OHCUB
		Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge
		Kevin Burdet, HOANW*
		Michael Patterson, HOANW*
		Renee Larson, HOANW*
		Kassidy Freitas, HOANW*
		Carmen Vidal, Other
		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald*
		Kelsey Shank, TheEdge
		Josh Patnaude, HAB Facil.*
		Lacey Mansius, HAB Facil.*
		Olivia Wilcox, HAB Facil.*
		Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facil.*

Day 2

Board Members and Alternates:

Antone Brooks, Primary*	Bob Suyama, Primary*	Bob Thompson, Primary*
Dan Solitz, Primary	Denise Jones, Primary	Emmitt Jackson, Primary*
Esteban Ortiz, Primary*	Gene Van Liew, Primary*	Gerry Pollet, Primary*
Jan Catrell, Primary*	LoAnn Ayers, Primary	Maxwell Woods, Primary
Rebecca Holland, Primary*	Richard Bloom, Primary*	Rob Davis, Primary*

Robert Waldher, Primary	Shelley Cimon, Primary*	Steve Wiegman, Primary*
Susan Coleman, Primary*	Tom Galioto, Primary	Chris Sutton, Alternate*
Dan Strom, Alternate	Leslie Koenig, Alternate	Liz Mattson, Alternate
Marissa Merker, Alternate	Mason Murphy, Alternate	Tom Sicilia, Alternate

Others:

Gary Younger, DOE*	Dave Einan, EPA	Dieter Bohrman, CPCCo*
JoLynn Garcia, DOE	Ginger Wireman, ECY*	Dana Cowley, HMIS
Mike Berkenbile, DOE*	Ryan Miller, ECY*	Debbie Kelley, HMIS
	Tom Rogers, WDOH*	Debra Yergen, HMIS*
		Gabriel Bohnee, HMIS
		Patrick Conrad, HMIS
		Edward Dawson, TradeWind
		Kermit Mankiller, NPT
		Li Wang, YN ERWM
		Matthew Campbell, CTUIR
		Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge
		Michael Patterson, HOANW
		Renee Larson, HOANW*
		Josh Patnaude, HAB Facil.*
		Lacey Mansius, HAB Facil.*
		Olivia Wilcox, HAB Facil.*
		Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facil.*

Note: Remote participants for this hybrid meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the chat box of Microsoft Teams, while in-person participants were asked to sign in on paper. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.

* Denotes that the individual attended and/or signed in for the meeting in-person